DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 610 RC 011 601

AUTHOR Goyette, Cherie A.; And Others
TITLE Technical Assistance Guide for Coordination of Farmworker Programs.
INSTITUTION Florida Technological Univ., Orlando. Div. of Sponsored Research.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.; Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE Oct 78
GRANT DOL-99-6-328-31-29
NOTE 47p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Problems; Communication Problems; Definitions; Delivery Systems; *Federal Programs; *Human Services; Interagency Cooperation; *Interagency Coordination; Interagency Planning; *Migrant Workers; Organizational Communication; *Organizational Theories; Seasonal Laborers

ABSTRACT

Written as a practical manual for human service providers at the local level, this guide discusses the interpersonal nature of coordination, gives historical background on the problems of program coordination at the federal level, and provides a detailed checklist for implementing coordination efforts among local agencies. Proposed techniques are based on experiences of four pilot projects funded to develop effective coordination of Department of Labor programs that serve migrant and seasonal farmworkers; the organizational framework and specific goals of these pilot projects are summarized. Background information, illustrating the failure of the federal government to provide a model for coordination, includes discussion of problems experienced by federal manpower programs as a result of program overlap, fragmentation, and poor information sharing. The special problems of farmworker programs are reviewed in light of the lack of coordination among the six federal agencies which serve or collect data on the farmworker. Principles of effective inter-agency coordination are discussed with emphasis on the need for identifying mutual goals and benefits, establishing well-defined agency roles and responsibilities, and communicating effectively with other agencies and with the client. (JH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

rec 04-09-79

ED175610

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
Office of Graduate Studies and Research
P. O. Box 25000
Orlando, Florida 32816

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GUIDE FOR COORDINATION OF FARMWORKER PROGRAMS

U.S. Department of Labor
Grant Number 99-6-328-31-29 Modification 003

Project Staff

Cherie A. Goyette - Director

Glenn K. Humes

Kathleen R. Petree

Sharon Sconiers

Oct 1978

This project was funded by the U.S. Department of Labor through the Florida State Department of Education which contracted with the Division of Sponsored Research at the University of Central Florida.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ralph D. Gunter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RC 011601

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
The Concept of Coordination	3
National Perspective	9
An Historical View of the Development of Issues in Coordination of Farmworker Programs	16
Pilot Project Background	22
Barriers to Overcome in Operationalizing Coordination	27
Coordination Checklist	39
Summary	44
Bibliography	45

INTRODUCTION

This technical assistance guide is written as a practical approach to coordination for human services providers. Though funded by the Department of Labor and geared to 303 program operators, the techniques and strategies suggested are applicable to most agencies receiving federal and state funds. Many of the techniques described have been employed by one of the four model coordinating projects.

The purpose of the TAG is to provide local program operators with a "how to do it" approach to coordination. As stated previously, techniques proposed are based on experiences of the four pilot projects which were funded by the Department of Labor in 1976 to explore coordinative efforts between 303 grantees and other Department of Labor funded programs which provide services to migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

More and more frequently, as government funds are allocated, the prescription "to coordinate" appears. This is especially true for "human services", or where the product or effect of one operation touches on (interfaces with) the product or effect of another. "Coordination" is an oft used word whether it be by government organizations or private enterprise.

Yet coordination is often viewed as a mysterious entity, inherently good, but escaping definition, and which will develop if left alone. For all the experience people have had in coordinating (or attempting to), little of this knowledge has been gathered together, synthesized, or formulated into some useful suggestions. As a result, most coordinative activities begin from scratch.

Coordination is a distinctly human process, and depends heavily upon interpersonal skills. Consequently, to a large degree, every effort to coordinate will enter new territory, as variable and unpredictable as human beings themselves. Also, as coordination is a relationship rather than a structure (although there are structures which can facilitate coordination), it does not have closure. Refinements and adjustments to relationships will continue as long as the interrelating parties continue to be interested in their relationship.

Yet within the diversity of human beings and human organizations and human activities and goals, there are commonalities. While it might be too strong to suggest that there are "scientific laws for coordination", it is useful to affirm that there are a number of generalizations, which when considered by managers, program operators, and coordinators, would be helpful in developing closer and more harmonious relationships.

This pamphlet has the intention of describing some commonalities and specifics that might facilitate any coordinative enterprise. It is hoped that this overview will help operators to become better aware of the multiple factors that must be considered if coordination is to work.

THE CONCEPT OF COORDINATION

What Does Coordination Mean?

Coordination implies the intentional functioning of one entity in regards to another so that the functions, shape, or output of both entities are modified. What is achieved, ideally, is a harmonious interaction. The most perfect example, perhaps, of mutually beneficial, interdependent interactions exists among the organs of the human body.

It might be said that coordination now and always exists, and is as universal and durable as the laws of gravity. It is true that one activity may produce an effect or adjustment on another activity, no matter how distant or dissimiliar the two activities may appear to be. This awareness lies behind the growing concern with the total ecology of the planet on which we live.

However, our concern will be with what might be described as "intentional coordination", a conscious, purposeful attempt between two or more persons or organizations to relate in such a way that their interactions increase or improve the products of each.

Why Coordinate?

Simply stating a principle as a truism may be the greatest barrier to getting that principle implemented. An unreasoned policy may hide a number of unresolved issues or contrary meanings beneath an apparently acceptable statement.

Attempting to coordinate without clearly delineating the value to be expected, the extent it is to be pursued, the methods employed to achieve it, or how its results are to be assessed, may result in an impulsive, one-sided endeavor of one organization to impose its will upon another. Coordination then assumes a mantle of respectability over what is actually

4. Effective coordination can help preserve the identity and integrity of the participating entities. Conflict where there should be harmony and waste where there should be efficiency can eventually lead to the deterioration of one or both organizations.

5. Activities which are logically coordinated are more reflective of the human being who is client. Just as the human organism is an integrated, interacting system, service provisions cannot meet needs if they are fragmented, sporadic, and non-sequential. Clients become fragmented, frustrated, thwarted and waste too much time and effort trying to avail themselves of services. Some decide the effort is not worthwile. Others get lost trying to locate the right person or agency to contact. For many, the time, "hassle", and cost involved appear to outweight the benefits anticipated.

Some Elements of Coordination

Coordinative activities may be described as "internal - vertical" or external - horizontal". This is largely a relative factor depending upon the perspective from which one is looking at the coordinating entities. Coordination between components which could not function properly (or exist) without cooordination can be classified as internal. The interdependency of functions within the human organism is a good example. The relationship between departments within a company is similar. A malfunction in the relationship between any two or more departments within the company would affect the health and productivity of the whole. For example, if the coordinative process between sales and shipping is broken, business is lost.

External coordination refers to a relationship between two or more entities, each of which would continue to exist and function with some degree of success should that relationship end. It is much like establishing a friendship. The two individuals could still function without it, but the friendship improves the quality of each of their lives.

Since external coordination involves equals, whose existence is not dependent on that coordination, a process of mutual acceptance and joint agreement is required. It is a two way street. Mutual benefits must be anticipated. The processes used to develop this coordination are based on persuasion, compromise, interpersonal skills, and clear communication.

Coordination may also be described as "formal or informal" and "planned or spontaneous". The first set describes whether or not a rather well defined, systematic process is established through which coordination is achieved, or whether it occurs through unscheduled, irregular contacts. The latter describes whether or not coordination is systematically planned as an integrated feature in the operation of an organization, or if it arises as the need and awareness indicate. Related to these terms are those of being "temporary" or "continuous". An example of informal activities is outreach workers doing coordination without established linkages between agencies because they have the best interest of the client in mind.

Coordination may also be perceived as vertical or horizontal. The former usually refers to internal coordination, the interrelationships between the various levels within an entity. Horizontal coordination applies to relationships between comparatively equivalent units of separate entities. However, it may also refer to activities between departments or units within a single organization which occupy a similar level in the organizational hierarchy.

The value of distinguishing between "external and internal" and "vertical and horizontal" becomes clearer by briefly looking at communications within and between organizations. Communication is an interpersonal transfer of information, ideas, beliefs, feelings, attitudes, policies, and commands which provide the foundation for coordinative activities. Coordination implies distinct activities or results in response to communication. Communication may be viewed as a catalyst, while coordination is the chemical reaction which takes place.

An organization might interface at one or more points for the purposes of coordination. However, if the products (problems as well as achievements) of this interface are not transmitted "vertically" within each of the organizations, the results of coordination are likely to be shortlived. At one level, policy making and administration will not reflect the coordinative products. At another level, the outcomes of coordination will not be disseminated. In other words, external coordination is only as successful as internal, vertical coordination is.

Coordination is a linkage. Like an electric current, the transmission of power remains possible only as long as the circuits remain unbroken.

Some underlying principles of coordination might be suggested at this time:

1. There must be a willingness to coordinate.
2. There must be a purpose to coordinate.
3. The effects of coordination must be greater than the sum of the effects of the individual entities without coordination.
4. There must be a mutuality in coordination.
5. There must be a processes to facilitate coordination.

6. There must be a procedure for the dissemination of the effects of coordination.

7. There must be a consensus on communication and problem solving techniques.

NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

In the past several years, the federal government has placed increased emphasis on planning, budgeting, and evaluation. This is based on the assumption that an analytical approach will provide programs which are properly conceived and properly administered. However, too often programmatic activities do not derive from a superstructure of well considered national policy.

Harbison in the book Human Resources As The Wealth of Nations stated that:

> No country has ever attempted to formulate a strategy for optimal development and utilizations of its manpower as a goal in itself. There is no core theory which attempts to explain the constellation of in the development and utilization of human resources. (1)

Consequently, reactions are based on short term motives, piecemeal formulas. Pressures to reduce inflation lead to the rather abominable practice of accepting high unemployment. Unconscionably, the target unemployment level is modified upward from time to time. As Jerome M. Rosow points out in New Dimensions in United States Human Resource Policy "one percentage point can represent a million more people unemployed." With a national policy rather than ill-conceived reactions, he believes that it is realistic to provide "a decent job for everyone willing and able to work." (2)

Much of the problem may stem from an inadequate analysis of the human being. Ginzberg states economists have labored under the misconception that the individual as a totally "conscious, rational, calculating, pleasure-seeking animal" without regard to the "complex psychological organism responding simultaneously to internal and external forces which can be

differentiated into basic drives, adjustment mechanisms, and value orientations." (3) As a result, the tendency is to simplify the individual, giving weight to innate differences between those who succeed and those who fail.

Ginzberg can also be quoted as saying that:

> The new psychology has made us realize that all human ability is learned and that the fact that some people become competent and others do not depends much more on the opportunities that they have encountered to become educated and trained than on their genetic potential.

Recognition of socially imposed handicaps have been dramatized in a number of Great Society programs. Programs developed by the Economic Opportunities Act have made various attempts to rectify this imbalance, with Head Start a good example. Yet for all the stirling values of specific programs, the failure to include them into an overall national policy, leaves services fragmented and fortuitous.

> ...manpower policy in the broadest sense is concerned with the development, maintenance, and utilization of actual and potential members of the labor force. (4)

Implied in such a policy is understanding the human person as a total being and the family as in integrated unit. Deriving from this is the necessity of providing systematic and timely opportunities reflecting the developmental needs of the human being and the family. David A. Weeks, in the preface to "Human Resources: Toward Rational Policy Planning", suggests that what is needed is a "new central focus--the individual worker and his family - rather than concentrating on service to groups..." (5) "Program eligibility could then become dependent on the client-family progress toward the goal." (5). This is a promising suggestion. It does

not entail the reduction of services to individuals who are members of a recognizable group that is encountering serious difficulties, but rather that the individual, and the family, will be assisted in an appropriate, holistic, and meaningful way.

The Manpower Development Training Act of 1962 was based on the assumption that there was no shortage of jobs but "...the fault was that the unemployed lacked the appropriate education or skills, were located in the wrong places and were immobile..." (6). Joint responsibility for administration of the act was delegated to DOL & HEW, with the former given the prime responsibility for research, experimentation, and demonstration. Internal competition developed between the U.S. Employment Service, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, and the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training for ultimate responsibility and control. "The new program was launched with the handicaps of divided authority, complex administrative procedures, and limited experience." The USES was particularly burdened, lacking the ability to deal with a range of new and innovative programs requiring outreach and more than job matching services with which it was accustomed. With the establishment of a plethora of programs - Job Corps, NYC, Work Experience and Training Program, Manpower Components of Community Action, New Careers, Operation Mainstream, and Special Impact Programs, the competition for local clients increased.

Among the inequities pointed out in Toward a Manpower Policy was the amazing variety of funding sources and eligibility requirements and allocation periods, often within the same agency. One example was a program funded at approximately $100,000 from sixteen different sources.

Growing recognition was given to the "...lack of coordination and overlapping efforts (which) seriously impair the effectiveness of present manpower programs with the awareness that this lack of coordination is particularly serious at the local level, but it is aggravated by the variety of federal agencies through which local authorities must operate." While some proponents argued that the multiplicity of similar efforts assured healthy competition, by and large the absence of clear cohesive policy and interagency coordination was viewed as extremely wasteful. R. Thayne Robson in Toward A Manpower Policy argues that coordinative activities including planning, programming and budgeting, especially at the local level are essential.

> The total needs of the community must be adequately assessed and national polices must be developed for channeling investments into training facilities and faculty for moving disadvantaged people successfully into the world of work. Overlap and duplication of effort is wasteful and unnecessary. Without adequate and coordinated planning, serious gaps emerge within the community, and some citizens do not receive the service and assistance that the programs are supposed to provide. (4)

Business leaders have expressed concern about the lack of direction and integration in national manpower affairs. At the 1975 Conference on Human Resources a hard look was taken at the problems of labor supply, oversupply, job matching and training. The request was made for "a restructuring of welfare benefits, social security, unemployment payments, and manpower training programs into a single, integrated policy" (5). The complaint was made that the "fragmenting of programs into fifty state components, subdivided by hundreds of cities, in addition to the numerous federal agencies and departments with overlapping responsibilities, "can

only produce many different efforts with a low common denominator." (5) Granting that revenue sharing offered flexibility, "it results in a lack of national standards, guidelines or goals and evolves into an income transfer program to local governments rather than to the people" (5).

Local principalities have become anxious over their growing dependance on the manpower placements. Having become accustomed to the federal subsidy, they now are fearful of the possibility of cuts in the federal budget. Too often the program was not viewed in a true manpower context. As the former Secretary of the Department of Labor pointed out, the cities yield to the temptation to use public service employees in place of their regular employees, and give the least assistance to blacks, women, and lower skilled jobs. CETA ...is not a generalized solution for our unemployment problem.

The Conference was not simply content to point out failures and level criticisms. Rather it sought to provide constructive guidance to manpower policy development through the voice of one of its chief participants, Jerome Rosow. The following policy principles were ennunciated.

1. A heathy economy is indispensable for the fulfillment of human goals. Therefore, manpower policy by definition requires a humanistic frame of reference.

2. Manpower is a valuable national asset.

3. Manpower policy would be an integral part of national economic policy. (The Employment Act of 1946 had its goal of maximum employment. However, a policy of curbing inflation through high unemployment changes the goal to "maximum feasible employment."

4. The free labor market system must be aided by new infrastructures. (This does not entail a more regulated economy but rather the provision of systems for a more rational use of manpower.)

5. Adequate manpower policies require adequate financing. (Funding should be for long periods and in anticipation rather than reaction to cyclical events.)

6. The cost-benefit relationships are vital. (For credibility and acceptance, it must "require definition, tracking and evaluation."

The Conference Report contained numerous positive suggestions. Among them are the following recommended practices which should underly a sound national manpower policy.

1. The approach should reflect "a long-term, continuing policy . . . improvised manpower programs reflect a discontinuity of policy - or a policy void."

2. Required is "integrative, rather than selective, policy: provisions for private-public linkages are needed. Manpower policy should consist of a series of building blocks, with the several parts planned to fit into a cohesive whole. For example, the provisions of social security, unemployment insurance, and welfare programs should be closely connected. As escalation of pension benefits to offset inflation should be integrated with wage policy so that we do not simply create incentives to retire and disincentives to work.

3. Joint financing by all interested parties: Employers, employees and the government should all contribute...It broadens the base of support, it creates a healthy partnership, and it produces genuine incentives for all of the parties to make the plan succeed. Moreover, joint funding has a multiplier effect.

4. Provide economic incentives for private employers. (Examples given are the United Kingdom National Training Fund and Sweden's tax incentives to counteract economic slumps.)

5. Maximize the incentives for people to work. (Combination of income-transfer and work toward a decent minimum standard income, and not discouraging part-time employment for the unemployed.

6. Relate economic policy to full-employment policy. Monetary and fiscal policies must be evaluated in terms of their manpower effects.

7. Soften the cost of human change. Since the worker must bear most of the displacement costs of change, national policies should provide for softening or absorbing a decent share of these costs.

It was noted that much of the failure was the result of a poor information exchange. With the availability of advanced computer technology, there should be improved integration and dissemination of information for the use in the development of policy and programs. Kershaw points out, however, that "when this lack of information is combined with a rather narrow and possessive view of one's program, the effects on coordination are not good."

AN HISTORICAL VIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF ISSUES IN COORDINATION OF FARMWORKER PROGRAMS

Six Federal agencies sponsor programs designed to serve farmworkers or collect data on farmworkers are:

1) United States Department of Labor
2) United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare
3) United States Department of Agriculture
4) Community Services Administration
5) United States Department of Transportation
6) Legal Services Corporation

Since most of these agencies (and often various programs within each agency) use different data bases, the target population itself often differs from program to program, creating obvious difficulties in coordination.

These programs and agencies also differ in their definition of migrant and seasonal farmworkers, causing similar problems.

State and local programs funded by these agencies may also use varying data bases. Federal regulations governing state and local programs may be interpreted differently throughout the country.

Historically, the Community Services Administration appears to have primary responsibility for coordinating farmworker programs, as mandated by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Title III B, Section 315.

> Special Responsibilities: The Director shall be responsible for coordinating programs under this part with other Federal programs designed to assist or serve migrant and seasonal farmworkers, and for reviewing and monitoring each program.

Limited funding and an unsympathetic political climate have contributed to difficulties in the Community Services Administration carrying out this responsibility.

The United States Department of Labor's CETA program and the United States Department of Education's Migrant Education program have the highest funding level for farmworker programs.

The Office of Management and Budget's A-95 review process, particularly because of its relationship to the state clearinghouse and/or planning unit within various jurisdictions, has been ineffective in coordinating various governmental programs aimed at farmworkers.

A consensus of opinions from individuals within regional planning units who are involved with the A-95 review process indicates two primary reasons for this perceived ineffectiveness. They are:

1. Federal agencies do not take the process seriously.
2. Lack of resources, both funds and manpower, for in-depth reviews before evaluations and recommendations are made at local and regional levels, as well as at the clearinghouse itself.

Each federal agency which is involved in farmworker concerns talks about and often demands evidence of planning and coordination at regional and/or local levels, yet each agency also acts alone in developing project and geographical priorities. Lip service is paid to the need for coordinating procedures, yet actual program operation denotes limited coordinative activity.

The states themselves have occasionally attempted to establish coordination among farmworker programs. The nature of such attempts have varied. A few are advocates, others coordinate by publishing directories of services, yet others concentrate on outreach services.

In the few examples cited in the following paragraphs, no attempt has been made to include all services activities of the agencies mentioned.

The Migrant Labor Office of the Florida Department of Community Affairs publishes a list of agencies serving farmworkers in that state.

California's Office of Migrant and Rural Affairs has worked with private non-profit agencies to promote coordination as well as to support farmworker research in that state. Data could be utilized by concerned groups for planning and advocacy.

In West Virginia, the state Department of Labor has a migrant committee which publishes a Services Directory.

Maryland's Office of Program Coordination is part of the Department of Human Resources. A commission on Migratory Labor has been formed by this office with representation from private and public sectors.

Michigan has worked extensively on a common definition of farmworkers and on a comprehensive plan for delivery of services throughout the state.

Michigan has established a model for coordination of farmworker programs within that state which deserves consideration in the development of coordination efforts to address the needs of migrant and seasonal farmworkers. These activities include:

1) Identification of all agencies serving farmworkers, the nature of those services, eligibility requirements, and funding sources.
2) Designation of coordinating agency responsible for -
   a) comprehensive planning
   b) centralizing communications
   c) outreach throughout the state
   d) development of policy
   e) technical assistance
   f) advocacy for farmworker at appropriate levels
   g) establishment and enforcement of performance agreements in the various agencies serving farmworkers

Washington's State Office of Migrant Services is working on a comprehensive plan to deliver migrant services. They have documented difficulties in coordinating farmworker services because of conflicting Federal regulations. This unit is attached to the Governor's Office and acts as an inter-agency Task Force for agricultural workers.

Private non-profit agencies and community based organizations have also formed coordinating councils on state and local levels in some states. Members may also include representatives from concerned governmental agencies. Historically, coordinating attempts may have focused (within one agency or among several agencies) on the geographical, economic, and/or sociological diversities in areas served. Although some formal agreements have existed, informal communication and referral systems are more common. Systems currently used will be described throughout this text.

California's La Cooperativa is an example of an organization funded by that state's 303 providers. La Cooperativa itself does not compete for funds, thus it cannot be in competition with those it serves. Representatives of state agencies concerned with farmworkers also sit on La Cooperativa's Governing Board.

La Cooperativa Campesina, in its newsletter of the same name, Vol. 1, No. 2, explains the organizations's functions as follows:

> "For those not familiar with La Cooperativa, this brief description of some of our activities will provide an insight into who we are in terms of action rather than history or membership composition. There are four major goals, ten objectives and some twenty-two activities. La Cooperativa has established as one of its primary goals the improvement of the quality of information about Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers (MSFW's) in order to better identify successful ways to serve their needs. In this context, La Cooperativa: a) reviews past and present efforts, methodologies and tools used in determining MSFW needs while providing interagency alternatives to meet these needs and, b) reviews, explores the implications and anticipates trends in policy, planning, and resource allocations, these federal, state, and local legislative activities impact upon the delivery of services to MSFW's.

Secondly, La Cooperativa is committed to coordination of efforts and the promotion of an interagency focus on MSFW's. Linkages between CETA, Title III, Section 303 organizations, other Department of Labor programs and titles, State agencies and community based organizations are emphasized in order to maximize the usage of limited resources available to serve MSFW's.

La Cooperativa staff, therefore, a) reviews cooperative ventures, establishes pilot activities and recommends ways to eliminate or circumvent real, artificial, or imagined barriers to coordination, and b) prepares summaries of successful cooperative efforts to share with others, especially if those efforts demonstrate ways to save time in establishing MSFW eligibility to receive services, increases the number of persons served or improves the quality of services, and contributes to an exchange of information that will speed up and complement services to which farmworkers are entitled.

Third, La Cooperativa works to maximize the effectiveness of 303 operators, community based organizations and governmental agencies serving MSFW's by a) providing technical assistance and informational exchange channels on legislation affecting farmworkers; b) providing a means by which effective programs are made known and promoting exchanges between program operators staffs with particular expertise needed by other service providers; providing policymakers and legislators with direct input on MSFW concerns and issues.

Finally, La Cooperativa staff is working with its Board of Directors to provide the board with professional input that will improve the efficiency and effectiveness in their decision-making and policy-setting functions. In this context, all Cooperativa staff is given professional and self-development opportunities in order to become a more professional management team to serve the 303 operators in the State.

For the future, the staff and the Board of Directors will work together in developing a more comprehensive and coordinated effort at both the state and national levels.

The need for coordination has arisen because many different agencies (as well as a variety of programs within each agency) were mandated/funded to address some aspect or aspects of farmworker problems. A diversified approach has thus been present from the beginning. Farmworkers have been defined, counted, and served differently according to the agency involved. Problems of farmworkers have seldom, if ever been addressed holistically.

Attempts to coordinate have been hampered by differences in data bases, eligibility criteria and definition, as well as differences in Federal Regulations governing the various programs.

In the judgement of many farmworker program operators the differences in data bases result in an inequitable sharing of federal monies amont the state.

Analyzing these problems is outside the scope of this technical assistance guide. The Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs' report entitled Toward an Equitable CETA 303 Allocation Formula for Farmworkers: The Impact of Definitions, Eligibility Criteria and Data Bases (July 1978) provides relevant data, analyses and recommendations.

According to the AFOP report: (p.3)

> "Conflicting definitions of a single target population have been the most obvious reason for a lack of coordinative services to migrant and seasonal farmworkers. Restrictive eligibility criteria have been the most frustrating regulation to those intake workers who must turn indigent farmworkers away. Varied funding sources have been the major obstacle to administrative attempts to consolidate migrant and seasonal farmworker programs."

The competitive process has also contributed to the development of problems in coordination among farmworker programs, especially among CETA 303 Program Operators. These agencies compete yearly for their state's share of 303 funding allocations. Several program operators have stated that to coordinate with the competition (perhaps sharing expertise in the process) is tantamount to helping the competition and insuring one's own future unemployment.

PILOT PROJECT BACKGROUND

Four pilot projects were funded by the Department of Labor to explore coordination among Department of Labor funded agencies and to delve into ways in which these agencies could improve their delivery of services to migrant and seasonal farmworkers. Pilot projects were located in four states: New York, California, Texas and Florida. The project in California had its inception one year prior to the other three states and the second year of the California effort was spent implementing and expanding upon findings of the first year's endeavors.

As already stated, the goal of the pilot projects was to explore coordinative efforts among agencies serving migrant and seasonal farmworkers. Secondary to this goal was the development of programs that would improve the delivery of services to the farmworkers. Each pilot project was allowed leeway in approaches to meeting the goal of coordination. One commonality that existed among all the pilot projects was that none were to be direct service providers. The following section will discuss the organizational framework of each pilot project and specific goals established within each project.

Farmworker Services Special Coordinating Project

The pilot project in New York State was identified as Farmworker Services Special Coordinating Project. Four agencies cooperated in the funding effort in New York State. Those agencies were: 1) Employment Service, New York State Department of Labor, 2) Manpower Planning Secretariat, New York State Department of Labor (now CETA Operations Division, 3) Program Funding Incorporated (now Rural New York Farmworker Opportunities Program) and 4) the Suffolk County Department of Labor. The policy

board was composed of one representative from each of the sponsoring agencies.

Pilot project staff consisted of a director employed by the State Department of Labor and six coordinators; three employed by the New York State Department of Labor and three employed by Rural New York Farmworker Opportunities. The policy board acted on all major decisions including hiring of the director, grant modifications and the location of the pilot project staff. The pilot project director was responsible for the day-to-day operation of the program including supervising and monitoring the field staff and implementing decisions of the policy advisory board.

Specific project goals were the improvement of services to migrant and seasonal farmworkers through more effective coordination, reducing any duplication of services, increasing communication among all agencies serving farmworkers and improving skill levels within and between the participating agencies. Field staff members were organized into teams of two, co-located among three offices. The location of the offices was approved by the policy board.

Staff members from Rural New York Farmworker Opportunities were designated as Farmworker Supportive Services Coordinators. The three Department of Labor employees received the title of Farmworker Employment and Training Services Coordinators. Location of the three offices were Warsaw, Sodus and Newburgh. The field staff worked together to provide a linkage between their respective agencies.

Texas Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Pilot Coordination Program

The pilot effort in Texas was known as the Texas Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Pilot Coordination Project. The principal coordinating agencies sponsoring the project and forming the governing board were as follows:

Associated City-County Economic Development Corporation of Hidalgo County (ACCEDC)

Community Action Council of South Texas (CACST)

Economic Opportunities Development Corporation of San Antonio and Bexar County (EODC)

Manpower Education and Training, Inc. (MET)

Texas Employment Commission (TEC)

The project staff consisted of representatives of the participating agencies with an employee of EODC appointed as director of the project. Expressed goals of the project were to improve existing coordination between the 303's and the Texas Employment Commission in their delivery of services to migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

The project director/coordinator was directly responsible to and monitored by the board of directors. The board of directors also supervised the hiring of the project coordinators who were housed among each of the participating agencies. Specific responsibilities of the coordinators was the interfacing of agency services with a specific focus on interagency coordina ion between all agencies located within the target area of the parent 303 program.

La Cooperativa Department of Labor Pilot Project

The pilot project in California was operated by La Cooperativa Campesina de California and known simply as La Cooperativa Department of Labor Pilot Project. La Cooperativa Campesina de California is in itself a coordinating body established in 1976 for the purpose of coordinating the resources and services available to farmworkers in California. La Cooperativa is composed of nine private non-profit and public entities.

One staff person was designated as director of the pilot project and as such was responsible for day-to-day operation of pilot project activities. Supervision of this individual was provided by the executive director of La Cooperativa. Pilot project activities were approved by the board of La Cooperativa which is composed of representatives from each of the agencies.

Florida Technological University Pilot Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Project

The Florida Technological University Pilot Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Project was the funding conduit for pilot project activities in the state of Florida. Three agencies participated in sponsoring the project: 1) the Adult Migrant Education Program (303 grantee), 2) the Office of Manpower Planning and 3) the Florida State Employment Service. Funds were awarded to the Florida Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education which subsequently subcontracted to Florida Technological University.

The advisory board for the pilot project was composed of representatives from each of the three sponsoring agencies i.e., Adult Migrant Education, Florida State Employment Service and the Office of Manpower Planning. The project director was selected by the advisory board and then given the liberty to hire the remainder of the project staff. Professional positions other than the directorship were three: a coordinator for planning and evaluation, a coordinator for needs assessment and a coordinator for resource assessment. Project staff were all based in the same location, a small office in the midst of the Central Florida farmworking community.

1) A needs assessment conducted among the migrant and seasonal farmworkers in a four-county Central Florida area to measure the farmworkers perception of needs and services.

2) A resource assessment conducted among agenies providing services to farmworkers with concentration placed on the Employment Service, CETA offices, and the Adult Migrant Education Program.

Based on statistical results of the assessments, recommendations and models for improved coordination were devised.

BARRIERS TO OVERCOME IN OPERATIONALIZING COORDINATION

The Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs, in their final report on "Toward an Equitable CETA 303 Allocation Formula for Farmworkers" stated that it was not assumed at the outset that universal definitions of "migrant" or "farmworker" were possible or necessary, but in the course of examining various programs, it became evident that much of the fragmentation and lack of coordination among programs that serve the same populations results from the variances in definitions. The report maintains that while the Community Services Administration still retains the legislative responsibility for coordination of all farmworker programs, its appropriations have been reduced so drastically that it virtually has no resources to apply to coordination.

In the book, The Principles of Organizations, James D. Mooney defines coordination in organizations as "the orderly arrangement of group effort to provide unity of action in the pursuit of a common purpose." He maintains that coordination must contain in its essence the supreme coordinating authority. It is also just as important to have a formal process through which the coordinating authority operates from the top throughout the organizations body. Mooney maintains that the sphere of organization is mutuality of interest. True coordination must be based upon a genuine community of interest in the attainment of the desired objective. In the humanistic phases of organization being obligated to mutual service is sometimes called cooperation, integration, functonal relating, and integrated functioning, however all show the professional and human sides of coordination which are inseparable.

Coordination implies a goal, an aim or objective. In coordinating federal farmworker programs, the ultimate goal would be the self-sufficiency of farmworkers brought about by a comprehensive delivery of services.

It has been the experience of the Florida Technological University Farmworker staff that theoretically, the coordinative principle is an ideal approach to the delivery of services. However, practically, the coordinative principle does not always operate effectively nor efficiently. There are several humanistic as well as professional barriers to overcome before coordination of farmworker programs or any service delivery program can become a reality. These obstacles to coordination will be further discussed with a two-fold purpose. First so that agencies and individuals interested in attempting coordination will be aware of possible hinderances. Usually it is easy to cite all the reasons why a concept is not feasible, so this section will also mention specific activities carried out by each of the pilot projects that were successful in overcoming barriers to coordinations.

People Problems

Ambiguous interpretations of the term "coordination" often times result in fruitless efforts to provide a total comprehensive delivery of services to farmworkers. Attempts at coordination may range from once-in-a-while coffee breaks to monthly, bi-weekly, or weekly work sessions of several departments' representatives. Work sessions too often consist of an exchange of information on the functions of each agency, the target groups served, and referrals that are made for supportive services. Not only is there a lack of communication between agencies, but there is also a lack of communication within some agencies, especially large ones where there is a hierarchy of procedures that must be followed for complete

delivery of services. Employees who perform specialized services are usually proficient in their areas of specialization, yet they are often totally unaware of the responsibilities of other staff members.

Problems at work sessions include: 1. defensiveness about one's own program, (turf and territory problems), 2. budgetary or funding problems (the feeling that undeserving agencies receive the most funds), 3. egocentrism (the feeling that one's programs are better than another agency's programs), 4. fear of duplications of programs serving the same clientele, and 5. fear of overlapping territories (geographical locations of satellite offices of agencies). All of the aforementioned problems are realistic ones that do occur from time to time in certain catchment areas.

Competitiveness among employment agencies is overwhelming, and it is extremely difficult to coordinate with an agency when you perceive that you are competing for the same clientele. Continued funding is based on service provision and the feeling does exist that there are not enough clients.

Staff members of agencies are trained to be competitive, and strive for points in a system that counts quantity moreso than quality. Not only is there ambiquity in the interpretation of "coordination" by managers of offices, but each staff member probably has a different interpretation of the term. This has been the case in each of the four pilot projects. The majority of the farmworkers in the catchment areas of the four pilot projects are Hispanics and blacks. However, in the Central Florida area, there has been a tendency by service agencies to hire whites in direct contact positions with farmworkers. A lack of knowledge and understanding about the spanish and/or black cultures can act as a hinderance to coordinating farmworker programs. In order to coordinate, one must first understand and empathize with the populations that programs are planned for.

With people problems and feelings of competitiveness among agencies one of the major barriers to coordination is the lack of communication. As already mentioned, multi-service agencies have similar problems within their own organizational structure.

One pilot project's attempt at bringing agencies together to foster coordination and understanding of their respective functions was the establishment of an inter-agency council. Representatives from all agencies serving farmworkers met on a regularly scheduled basis to discuss their agencies and services but more importantly to explore methods of improving their services.

Interagency coordinating councils can be established for several purposes and at several levels. Depending on the composition of the council's membership, i.e. each representative's level of authority within their respective agency, the council can be an effective policy-making group or merely an avenue for sharing of information.

A commitment to coordination from each agency's director is the key to a successful coordinating council. The director/manager does not have to serve on the council but must be willing to delegate responsibility and then act on council decisions. Regardless of an agency's representative, a willingness to listen and to coordinate will determine the degree of synergism achieved by the agencies.

On a lower plane and not as effective, coordinating councils can be established to serve in an information-exchange capacity. Again, each agency serving migrant and seasonal farmworkers would appoint representatives to the council. Regularly scheduled meetings would be held at which time on a rotating basis each agency would conduct a mini-training session regarding their specific roles and services provided to and for farmworkers.

Agencies would be responsible for distributing materials at their particular session. These materials would contain pertinent information on the agency and would be used to compile a directory of services. Regularly schedules meetings would assist in keeping the directory updated.

To carry the concept one step further, each agency representative to the coordinating council would have several functions: 1) to present information about his/her respective agency 2) to carry back to his/her agency information about the other agencies and 3) to provide training within his/her own agency.

Interagency coordinating councils are not a novel or unique concept. What is perhaps novel and unique is that they actually do exist and serve a utilitarian function. Once communication and a mutual understanding between agencies is established with a commitment to coordination as the base, the end result will be better services for all clients.

Another significant approach toward overcoming the barrier caused by people problems was that employed by the New York pilot project in co-locating personnel from two different agencies in the same office. Clients were assessed by needs and then the agency best able to meet those needs provided services.

A specific goal in establishing the team consisting of a Department of Labor employed person and a 303 employed person was that of formalizing open lines of communication between the two agencies and establishing a working relationship that would carry over beyond the duration of the project's funding cycle.

Institution Problems

As already stated, the responsibility to coordinate farmworker programs on the federal level has never been clearly established. The Department of Labor has special funds allocated to provide comprehensive services

to farmworkers. The Department of Agriculture has the responsibility of coordinating rural development services. The Community Services Administration is authorized to coordinate programs for farmworkers, but it does not have the necessary funds to do so.

The structure of coordinating agencies can either facilitate or hinder the process, as illustrated by an attempt at coordination in one of the pilot projects.

The following passage is an exact quote from a member of the California Pilot Project's Board of Directors, and it exemplifies one of the many institutional problems in coordinating farmworker programs:

> "Linkage and "Coordination" is a phrase which we have each included in our individual program proposals and is the central purpose or our respective Pilot Programs.
>
> Like many concepts, "Linkage and Coordination" has two extreme positions. At one extreme, a program could be operating without any contact between itself and any other agency(s) in its community - zero "Linkage and Coordination". At the other extreme, a program could be operating as a fully integrated unit within another agency in its community - 100% "Linkage and Coordination". In the first case, the program could be making decisions and taking actions with total disregard of other agency(s) concerns. In the second, every decision, every action would require prior authorization by the "other" coordinating agency(s).

The director of the agency involved goes on to say that linkage refers to a manner or style of being united, yet the phrase "linkage and coordination" implies a degree of subordination, and one agency cannot coordinate with others unless each coordinating agency is willing to eliminate totally independent decisons and actions, and make all decisions based upon other agencies considerations. He feels that coordination would be a threat to smaller, private, non-profit agencies, rather than the large government agencies.

Therefore, the structure of the coordinating agencies must be as clearly defined as the structure/hierarchy within the agencies attempting coordination. Responsibilities must be clearly defined, and functions cannot overlap within agencies within the same structure.

One pilot project's attempt at coordination which to be successful had to include coordination between agencies was the establishment of a 24-hour emergency hot-line. Funds were expended by the pilot project to set up the system.

Posters, pamphlets and flyers advising farmworkers of the availability of the service were distributed throughout the agricultural sections of the state. Farmworkers were able to call a toll-free number, state their problem and receive assistance.

Though all calls were received at a central location, individuals throughout the state served in the capacity of problem solving and referral specialists. During the implementation phase, the burden fell on a few individuals from one of the 303 agencies.

In theory the concept has extreme value for all social service programs regardless of the clientele. Many states presently provide WATS telephone service for spouse abuse and child abuse. With the network already established, extension of the system should not be too complex or costly. Emergency calls would be received and then referred to the agency with services to meet the needs.

The project sponsoring the Hot-Line also had thousands of credit-card type plastic cards printed with the emergency number stamped on them. There were widely distributed throughout the state. Efforts were made toward distributing the cards in other states that serve as homebases for the East Coast Migrant stream.

Communication Processes and Problems

Obstacles to clear communication can arise from language differences, styles of communication, definitions, and the differences in the media or channels most familiarly used in communication. That is, some find face to face contact the most comfortable and resilient of communication processes, while others prefer the written word. A coordinator needs to respond to several questions.

Am I clear about what I am saying? Does the person to whom I am communicating indicate that he understands what I am saying?

Am I listening?

Am I hearing what is being said?

Am I responsive?

What points are apparently understood differently by the communicators?

Am I reacting with hostility, negativity to the communication?

What do the silences express? Agreement? Hostility? Disinterest?

Frames of reference are those fundamental statements around which an array of beliefs and other assertions hang. Many communications are interrupted because certain underlying beliefs are in conflict although unstated. These beliefs may represent ideologies, philosophies, psychological concepts, perceptions of human nature. Key terms indicating these differences include "radical", "conservative", sin, "morality", freedom, "individual responsibility", "good", etc.

It is not implied that coordination is dependent on getting everyone to see things in one way ("my way"). This is not likely to occur and any effort to make it occur would probably just disrupt any cooperation which had been attained. What is important is that there be an awareness and

understanding of possible underlying differences in reference frames. In this way, communication can proceed along avenues where mutual understanding does exist or has the possibility of existing. Understanding "where the other is coming from" is a step toward reduction of fear and misinterpretation. This will reduce fruitless negotiations over a matter based on hidden issues, many of which may actually not bear on the immediate problem under consideration.

For example one person may be a firm exponent of federal intervention. Another may be equally adamant on states rights. A federally funded project may find them both in apparently unresolvable conflict. However, agreement not in principle but on the issue of the actual program being discussed, may be achieved if negotiations are made as to how local initiative in the operation of the project can be assured. Assurances, carried out in deed, on the part of the federal representative that he or she will be responsive to local complaints and suggestions are also helpful.

Of course, reality requires the recognition that some conflicts may be insurmountable. In such cases, coordination may simply not exist until staff or attitudes change. One further pilot project effort toward coordination and the improvement of the delivery of services was the organization of "Open Houses." Open houses in this context refers to a series of one-day events held in various locations throughout the sponsoring state. Farmworkers were invited to attend the "Open Houses" in order to become familiar with the myriad services available from local agencies.

Pilot project staff members initiated the meetings between the employment service and 303 program operators. Initially it was intended that these two entities would comprise the agencies represented. It was realized that having more agencies involved would serve a much more meaningful purpose.

The pilot project also provided a small amount of money to defray any costs incurred. Staff members attended all planning sessions and served as technical assistance providers.

Cultural Variations

Successful coordination must take into accou.. the cultural variations which exist among staff and the target population. These differences include language, patterns of speech and communication, ways of doing business, lifestyles, temperaments, etc. For example, a food program which delivers commodities unpalatable to the user group is a failure. Another example, a highly coordinated program which provides services at one centralized location, disregarding the lack of transportation among rural farmworkers, is again a failure.

A successsful project will tend to have many staff members who closely identify with the target population. This is becoming fairly common for direct contact personnel, but is still rather rare among administrative positions. These distinctions within staff experience and outlook can seriously effect administration of a program. A wise administrator, through formal and informal sessions, as well as by example, will help to develop an exchange whereby cultural differences will be better understood and accommodated.

Some Special Characteristics of Farmworkers

It is difficult for an agency to extend or improve its services if there is no popular mandate to do so. In the final result, public concern and public pressure affects the level and quality of services.

Migrant and seasonal farmworkers are largely a "non-public". They generally do not vote, they frequently move, they are usually poor, they have a low educational achievement, they may speak a different language than the majority, ad they seldom organize. Too often they tend to tolerate a situation as a natural part of their lot.

Consequently, farmworkers are not likely to develop a sustained expression of grievance, focused on the access points of our system. They depend heavily on advocates and sympathizing functionaries. Coordinative activities benefitting migrant and seasonal farmworkers need to take these characteristics into account. Special attention must be given to participation of farmworkers in program development. This may be through the the inclusion of farmworkers in advisory capacities, or establishing appropriate access points for complaints and suggestions. One means to accomplish this is through a strategy for formal and informal surveying of the population. A good manager will know that his program reflects the advocated needs and feelings of a cross section of his service population.

The bulk of the coordination effort conducted by the Florida Pilot Project consisted of a comprehensive needs and resource assessment. Farmworkers in a four-county Central Florida area were interviewed regarding basic needs and their knowledge and perceptions of the agencies available to meet these needs. Conversely, agency personnel were also surveyed as to their perception of farmworker needs their respective agency's ability to meet those needs, and how well the agency was functioning toward meeting its mandate.

The information was analyzed and made available to agencies. There were distinctive differences between perceived and expressed needs. Again, employment of farmworkers in an advisory capacity would help insure that agencies were being responsive to actual needs.

Information such as that obtained has value only as long as it is current. Fiscal limitations prohibit conducting annual comprehensive assessments. The California Pilot Project developed a card which clearly delineates the client's past experiences with training and employment and present needs. It also establishes the farmworker's eligibility for services which as previously stated is further complicated by the different agencies involved and their operating definitions of what qualifies an individual as a migrant and seasonal farmworker. The information card lists basic needs and was designed to move with the client so that pertinent information will be available on each visit regardless of agencies.

The Colorado Migrant Council though not one of the participating pilot projects received funds through the Community Services Administration to develop a common intake form. The form is presently being field tested but provides eligibility as well as needs-assessment information. Tentative plans for redesigning the form include a section wherein each agency can obtain specific information necessary to meet their own eligibility criteria.

COORDINATION CHECKLIST

The following is a coordination checklist. Not all points will need to be considered in order to set up coordination procedures between agencies. It is not intended to be followed item by item but to be used as a guide or starting point. When planning coordination efforts there are an infinite number of details to be considered, some very simple whereas others are more complex. The checklist can be used to ensure that the most solient points will not be overlooked.

P O L I C Y

1. Mandated - Background of mandate

    + why is coordination considered?
    + what is to be accomplished?
    + how will it be carried out?
    + who is responsible?
    + is the mandate for all to be involved, or will one group be responsible for initiating coordination?
    + what support will be given to the coordinating entities?
        - funds
        - supervision
        - feedback
        - personnel
        - regulatory authorization

2. Initiated at lower level

    Self-examination

    + what are the goals of one's own project/agency?
    + what would be the purpose of coordination?
    + with whom would coordination be attempted?
    + what are the possible problems which may arise?
    + does coordination already exist?

D E V E L O P M E N T (BASIC)

Dialogue between units toward coordination

+ is there a mutual interest in coordinating?

+ if not, can the initiating agency demonstrate the possible benefits to the other organizations?

+ what are the similarities and differences between the entities?

  - goals

  - history

  - policies

  - regulations, etc.

+ what are the possible points of interface?

+ who would be responsible for monitoring, evaluating coordinative activities?

+ how would coordinative policies be modified?

Preparation of verbal or written agreement at the supervisory level on the general outline of coordinative objectives

+ a general statement of policies, goals, level of commitment, anticipated accomplishments, etc.

D E V E L O P M E N T (Planning)

Supervisory or designated representatives

1. Institutional variations

   How do the agencies differ specifically among each other?

   + funding

   + responsibilities

   + roles

   + history

   + procedures/policy

   + staff composition

- permanency
- culture
- language
- identification
- salary levels
- job characteristics

+ clients
+ geographical
+ long term goals
+ attitudes, perceptions, mind-sets, frames of reference

2. Pre-existing coordination

+ at what points do agencies already interface?
+ what contacts have already been established?
+ what mutual agreements/activities exist?
+ already established modes of communication?

3. Areas of potential coordination

+ what will coordination possibly accomplish?
+ how will it contribute/detract from each agencies mission?
+ what are the points of agreement?
+ what points are unresolved?
  - is there room for negotiation?
  - is there a possibility of compromise?
  - can there be give and take?
  - are there alternatives?
  - what are the precise barriers to agreement?

4. Formalizing a coordination agreement

   + who in the individual agencies will be responsible for the coordinative activities?

   + what will be the precise points and activities through which coordination is to be implemented?

   + what will the roles be for each agency, how will they differ?

   + how will coordinative activities be modified?

   + how will results of coordinative activities be evaluated?

   + how will coordinative results be transmitted to supervisory levels, parent agencies, other interested agencies?

   + what specific procedures are to be instituted to assure that coordination is an ongoing rather than an occasional process? Does this require any structural changes? Are these changes acceptable to the participating institutions?

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Designation of staff for coordination

   + Do they understand what coordination entails?

   + Have they been able to respond and provide input?

   + Do they support coordinative activities? Do they believe that it will benefit their organizational interests?

   + Are they able to undertake the communicative and interpersonal strategies required?

2. Systems designed for coordination

   + What are the processes established to implement coordination? Formal or informal?

   + Methods of communication (telephone, discussions, memoranda, joint staff meetings)

   + Is there a checklist specifying each step in the coordinating process?

   + Process for review and modification of coordinative activities?

- How are results/problems to be transmitted and by whom?

- Are provisions made for joint planning at appropriate stages of the planning cycle?

3. Training and personal development

   - Are staff kept informed of agency mission and roles of coordinating organizations?

   - Are staff sympathetic to coordinating activities? If not, how may their participation be increased?

   - Is regular training provided to familiarize staff with the needs and problems of clients?

   - Do staff members see their work as vital and instrumental to improving the condition of their clients?

   - Is cooperation between staff and the staff of other agencies viewed as a positive benefit?

   - What are the personal and career enhancement opportunities within the agency?

   - Is there regular training toward the development of communication and interpersonal skills?

SUMMARY

Coordination is a purposeful, positive interaction between two or more individuals or institutions for which goals or activities interface. It implies harmonious, cooperative endeavors which enhance the success of the component individuals or organizations.

A coordinated approach is especially desirable in the area of human service provision, where the ultimate goal of all participants is to increase the self-sufficiency of the human being. Integrated action is mandated by the fact that the human being is an integrated organism. In addition, the need for economy and efficiency of service further requires that heterogeneous efforts be meshed in a systematic, coordinated way.

This sound approach to human problems is debilitated by the fact that the primary funding organization, the federal government, does not have a unified manpower policy. It is further intensified by delivery systems based on competitive access to funding rather than to programmatic success, and the lack of federal and local leadership willing to address itself to the primary issues. Practical obstacles to cooperative and mutually enhancing human service enterprises include the failure to fully utilize the information and skills relating to interpersonal communication, personal development, and planning and implementation.

Improved delivery of human services leading toward greater self-sufficiency and economizing the human potential is not as mysterious as it sometimes appears. The requirements call primarily for a commitment to social and individual improvement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Harbison, Frederick, Human Resources As the Wealth of Nations, Oxford University Press, New York, 1973.

2. Rosow, Jerome, New Dimensions in United States Human Resource Policy, Public Affairs Planning, Exxon Corporation.

3. Ginzberg, Eli, The Development of Human Resources, Mc-Graw Hill Book Company, New York, 1966.

4. Gordon, Robert Aaron, editor, Toward A Manpower Policy, Ch. 5 "The Need for Better Planning and Coordination", Joseph A. Kershaw, Office of Economic Opportunity, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1967.

5. Weeks, David A., editor, Human Resources: Toward Rational Policy Planning. The Conference Board, Inc., New York, 1975.

6. Mangum, Garth L., MDTA, Foundation of Federal Manpower Policy, The John Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland, 1968.